

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed September 20, 2010, claims 1-6, and 9 were rejected. Additionally, claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 were objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and the below-provided remarks. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments place the present application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal.

For reference, proposed amendments are presented for claims 1 and 6. In particular, the proposed amendment for claim 1 is presented to incorporate the allowable subject matter previously recited in claim 7. Similarly, the proposed amendment for claim 6 is presented to incorporate the allowable subject matter previously recited in claim 10. Consequently, claims 7 and 10 are canceled.

Additionally, new claims 12-16 are added to recite allowable subject matter. In particular, independent claim 12 is added to recite the limitations of claim 1 and the allowable subject matter of claim 8. Dependent claims 13-16 are added to recite the limitations of dependent claims 2-5, respectively.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of the claims and determination that claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1-6, and 9 were rejected based on one or more cited references. The cited reference(s) relied on in these rejections include:

Starr (U.S. Pat. No. 6,891,401, hereinafter Starr).

Pohlmeyer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,959,014, hereinafter Pohlmeyer).

In particular, claims 1-4, 6, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Starr. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Starr in view of Pohlmeyer.

Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over the cited references in light of the proposed amendments presented herein to incorporate allowable subject matter into the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the indicated rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey T. Holman/

Date: November 22, 2010

Jeffrey T. Holman  
Reg. No. 51,812

Wilson & Ham  
1811 Santa Rita Road  
Suite 130  
Pleasanton, CA 94566  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111